Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed August 9, 2007.

I. <u>Summary of Examiner's Rejections</u>

Claims 4-6, 8, and 10-18 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4-6, 8, and 10-18.

Claims 4-6, 8, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass (U.S. Pat. No. 6,993,774) in view of Fox et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,146,344).

Claims 10-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass in view of Fox further in view of Dattke et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0143835).

II. <u>Summary of Applicants' Response</u>

The present Reply amends claims 10 and 17, cancels claims 4-6, 8, 11-16, and 18, and adds new claim 19-42, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 10, 17, and 19-42. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

III. <u>Response to 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections</u>

<u>Claim 10</u>

Claim 10 was amended to include features that were previously claimed in Dependent Claims 11-16. The office action rejected Claims 10-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass in view of Fox further in view of Dattke

- 8 -

The office action conceded that Glass does not disclose initiating post-processing by the wrapper object. Furthermore, Glass does not disclose "the wrapper class extended from a superclass which implements a predefined wrapper interface that includes a pre-invocation handler and a post-invocation handler."

The office action alleged, however, that Dattke teaches a wrapper object initiating post-processing by the wrapper object. However, Dattke teaches a dynamic proxy for an extension object that can communicate to a sorter, logger, and result handler. Dattke does not disclose a post-invocation handler or post-processing being performed by the wrapper object.

Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment as defined in Independent Claim 10 is not obvious in view of Glass, Fox, and Dattke. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection to claim 10 be withdrawn. Dependent Claims depend from Claim 10. For at least the reasons discussed above with regards to Claim 10, dependent Claims 21-31 are also patentable. Dependent claims 21-31 add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Independent Claim 17 and dependent Claims 19-20 and 32-42 are also patentable for the reasons above. Independent Claim 17 and dependent claims 19-20 and 32-42 add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right.

IV.   Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 8, 2007   By: /Thomas K. Plunkett/
                                               Thomas K. Plunkett
                                               Reg. No. 57,253

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800